

In the claims:

Kindly amend claim 50 as follows:

Claim 50 (previously added, currently amended).

A motion transmission and multiplication system for use with systems, devices [or] and structures that require movement of segments, to enable extendable and retractable motion, [such as] to be used with cleaning systems, measuring systems, hand-movable tools, music instruments and accessories, electrical and telecommunication devices, transportation and delivery systems, shades, sailing boats, chairs, tripods, tables and tents, said motion transmission and multiplication system comprising: at least first and second hand-movable elements each having anterior and posterior ends, said elements extending in the same orientation, each element having at least one point thereon connectable to a tool or other object; and at least a first means linking said first and second elements and being movable with respect to at least one of them, said first linking means also being connectable to an additional element, said first linking means being arranged on said elements such that when said first linking means is moved with a controllably reversible driving motion with respect to either of said anterior and posterior ends of a selected reference one of either of said first and second elements, wherein said driving motion is in a direction in-line with said orientation, then said first and second elements, and if connected, said additional element are simultaneously provided with a controllably reversible and multipliable, non gravity dependent, linear-to-linear driven motion with respect to each other in-line with said orientation, said driven motion being in the same direction as said driving motion, or reverse thereto, in accordance with which reference one of said first and second elements was selected in respect of said driving motion.

## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the Office Action of August 08, 2005 rejecting all of the claims.

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant had already submitted to former Examiners A. Knight and Ackerman, via the responses of July 11, 2001 and April 25, 1999, remarks to some of the same prior art cited again in the latest Office Action, e.g., Pipes, White and Sandberg.